

## NEW BUDGET PLAN IS FORCED THROUGH

Convention Advances It to  
Third Reading, Defeating  
All Amendments.

### DEMOCRATS AGAINST IT

ALBANY, Aug. 11.—The executive budget plan reported from the Committee on Finance, of which Henry L. Stimson is chairman, was advanced to a third reading to-day without material amendment after the Constitutional Convention had devoted five of its sessions to a discussion of the project.

The Democrats suggested a number of material amendments and in some they were joined by at least a score of Republicans, but all of them were voted down decisively.

Republican delegates like Lemuel Ely Quigg, W. M. K. O'Connell and Edmund E. Quigg, including John Godfrey Saxo, did not think that the Constitution should compel the Governor to attend the sessions of either the Senate or Assembly and submit to a hearing, which they thought on occasion might not only prove undignified but insulting to the chief executive officer of the State. But Mr. Stimson, who is not known to any amendments and the convention stood by him. Mr. Stimson agreed with William N. Dyman of Brooklyn that an executive budget plan would tend to bring into the executive office stronger men and make men who occupy the office stronger and more self-reliant than is now possible.

Would Have to Toe Mark.  
Mr. Stimson insisted that the fact that a Governor was to be open to questioning by the Legislature would tend to bring out responsible utterance from the executive and do away with any attempt of a Governor to advance himself in the minds of the people by means of the Legislature by extravagant statements on the stump.

Assemblyman Alfred E. Smith offered an amendment to the budget plan which would give the members of each house more vote for a bill appropriating money for State purposes when less than the whole of the State is benefited by the money appropriated, except appropriations for the repair and maintenance of the canal or State buildings and construction of State institutions.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the budget will contain much more than half of the appropriations made by the State and that the Stimson plan only gave the people half of the relief desired in order to enforce economy in State expenditures.

Mr. Stimson would not accept this amendment, but had an amendment adopted providing that when heads of departments make estimates of appropriations for the coming year itemized estimates of appropriations to meet the financial needs of such departments they shall include "a statement in detail of the money for which any general or special appropriation is desired at the ensuing session of the Legislature."

More Lustre to a Gold Brick.  
Mr. Stimson thought that this amendment would cure the defect pointed out by Mr. Smith, but the latter insisted that it merely added "a little lustre and a little shine to the proposed gold brick."

"This amendment will not meet the situation," said Mr. Stimson, "because most of these special appropriations do not emanate from the heads of State departments but from members of the Legislature and localities."

"To show my good faith I am willing to compromise by providing that any special appropriation which the Governor will recommend along with his budget can be passed by the usual vote in the Legislature, except that special appropriations not suggested by the Governor must have a two-thirds vote in either house. This would prevent a legislator who has been turned down by the Governor from log rolling his appropriation through the Legislature by a party vote."

A Leroy Austin agreed with the purpose of Mr. Smith's amendment, but did not believe that a minority should be permitted to hold up an appropriation where a majority desired to establish a new policy of government.

Senator Wagner offered an amendment that one-third of the members of either house should be permitted to bring the Governor before them for questioning, but this was defeated by a vote of 49 to 39, nearly a score of Republicans voting for it. The Democrats then abandoned any further effort to perfect the amendment and it was advanced to a third reading.

### SAFEGUARD PLAN FAVORED

Deputy Attorney General Harold J. Hittman, as chairman of the committee on future amendments, reported favorably an amendment desired by the woman suffragists governing the submission of their amendments to the voters at the November election.

It provides that "if at the general election held in 1915 a majority of the electors voting thereon shall approve and ratify the amendment to section 1 of Article II of the Constitution now in force, heretofore proposed by the Legislature, section 1 of Article II of this Constitution shall be deemed thereby amended so as to embody therein the new matter contained in said proposed amendment so approved."

Chairman Hittman also reported favorably an amendment providing that hereafter a constitutional amendment shall not be considered adopted by the people unless "the number of votes cast and counted for or against the same shall equal at least two-thirds of the aggregate number of votes cast for members of the Assembly at such election."

### NOT LENIENT TO MASHERS.

Magistrate Cobb Tells Why He Imposed Small Fine.

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

## NEW STATE REORGANIZATION PLAN IS REPORTED FAVORABLY

Tanner Amendment to Constitution Would Consolidate  
Boards and Departments and Provide  
for the Short Ballot.

### ALBANY, Aug. 11.—The big fight in the Constitutional Convention will come next week over the Tanner plan reorganizing the State government by adopting the short ballot and giving the Governor power to appoint all heads of departments.

This plan was reported favorably to the convention to-night by Frederick C. Tanner, Republican State committee chairman and head of the convention committee on Governor and State officers. It provides only for the election of Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Attorney-General and Comptroller and the establishment of thirteen executive departments, the heads of which are to be appointed by the Governor.

The work now done by the 152 State departments and commissions is to be divided among these thirteen departments under laws to be passed by the Legislature next winter, and if the convention approves the Tanner plan it will go into operation on January 1, 1917, when the terms of the present elective State officials expire.

Term of Four Years.  
Along with the Tanner plan has been reported favorably from the same committee a constitutional amendment changing the term of the Governor from two to four years and his salary from \$10,000 to \$20,000 to take effect on January 1 next as to salary, but the four year term of Governor will not apply except to the Governor elected in 1918, so that the Governor elected next year will have but a two year term.

The Tanner plan has the support of Elihu Root and if it is adopted by the convention and the people it will be a determining factor as to who will be the Republican candidate for Governor next year. Gov. Charles A. Whitman has already announced that he is a candidate for re-nomination.

If Elihu Root is not to be the Republican nominee for President next year, the "Federal crowd" in the convention declare, Henry L. Stimson will be the next Republican nominee for Governor and Frederick C. Tanner the Republican nominee for Lieutenant-Governor. If Mr. Root is the candidate the "Federal crowd" will get behind ex-Attorney-General Wickham for Governor.

Old Guard to Fight.  
The Old Guard Republicans in the convention, who always have maintained the present State Republican organization independent of the Federal element, are taking the lead in opposing the plan to meet the financial needs of such departments they shall include "a statement in detail of the money for which any general or special appropriation is desired at the ensuing session of the Legislature."

Mr. Stimson would not accept this amendment, but had an amendment adopted providing that when heads of departments make estimates of appropriations for the coming year itemized estimates of appropriations to meet the financial needs of such departments they shall include "a statement in detail of the money for which any general or special appropriation is desired at the ensuing session of the Legislature."

Mr. Stimson thought that this amendment would cure the defect pointed out by Mr. Smith, but the latter insisted that it merely added "a little lustre and a little shine to the proposed gold brick."

"This amendment will not meet the situation," said Mr. Stimson, "because most of these special appropriations do not emanate from the heads of State departments but from members of the Legislature and localities."

"To show my good faith I am willing to compromise by providing that any special appropriation which the Governor will recommend along with his budget can be passed by the usual vote in the Legislature, except that special appropriations not suggested by the Governor must have a two-thirds vote in either house. This would prevent a legislator who has been turned down by the Governor from log rolling his appropriation through the Legislature by a party vote."

A Leroy Austin agreed with the purpose of Mr. Smith's amendment, but did not believe that a minority should be permitted to hold up an appropriation where a majority desired to establish a new policy of government.

Senator Wagner offered an amendment that one-third of the members of either house should be permitted to bring the Governor before them for questioning, but this was defeated by a vote of 49 to 39, nearly a score of Republicans voting for it. The Democrats then abandoned any further effort to perfect the amendment and it was advanced to a third reading.

Chairman Hittman also reported favorably an amendment providing that hereafter a constitutional amendment shall not be considered adopted by the people unless "the number of votes cast and counted for or against the same shall equal at least two-thirds of the aggregate number of votes cast for members of the Assembly at such election."

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

Magistrate Cobb, who was formerly Mayor Mitchell's law partner before he was appointed to the bench a short time ago, after hearing some comments on the \$5 fine imposed on a "masher" who accosted Dr. Cecile Griel, a woman physician in Washington Square, told a Sun reporter yesterday that the small fine in that case was not taken to be his estimate of the proper punishment of a "masher."

"There is no one more jealous of the rights of women to be on the streets and in the parks," Magistrate Cobb said. "There were, however, mitigating circumstances in the case of Cavallieri who spoke to Dr. Griel. In the first place she was out at an unusual hour—it was after midnight—but of course she had a right to be. It was also shown," Judge Cobb said, "that Cavallieri was not unduly persistent and she was not certain that he said anything insulting to her. All these things connected with the fact that the man had no previous record caused me to be lenient with him."

The Magistrate made it quite clear, however, that another "masher" might not fare so well in his court.

## WANTS ALLIES GLAD LIKE KNIGHTS OF OLD

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle Believes  
Costs of Mail Would Save Lives.

### STEEL HELMETS REVIVED

Special Correspondence to THE SUN.  
LONDON, July 30.—The use of armor, armor of the sixteenth century, if necessary, to withstand the fire of twentieth century machine guns is advocated by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the novelist, in a letter to the Times, a letter which has been a campaign for the revival of armor to meet the exigencies of modern warfare twenty-five years ago. He believes that demonstrations in the present war fully vindicate the position he has taken through these years.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

The London Times has been conducting a symposium recently, in which various opinions have been expressed regarding the utility of reviving the wearing of armor at the present time. Several authorities believe that costs of armor are too high, and that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, however, believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money. He believes that the wearing of armor is a waste of money.

## THE EASY WAY SOMETIMES—in a real estate deal—you find complications on every side. It is our business to help you with such problems. In fact, to us, they may not be problems at all. Past experience may have solved them already.

We shall be glad to have  
you consult us in regard to  
your real estate troubles.

### TITLE GUARANTEE AND TRUST CO

Capital . . . \$ 5,000,000  
Surplus (earned) 11,000,000  
175 Broadway, N. Y. 172 Broadway, N. Y.  
800 Fulton St., Jamaica.

## NEVER A LEGAL WIFE, SAYS GIULIA WERNER

Morosi Heiress Attacks Val-  
idity of Ex-Policeman's  
Reno Divorce.

Mrs. Giulia Morosi Werner's defence to the suit of her husband, Arthur M. Werner, ex-policeman, who has asked her to keep an agreement to pay him \$10,000 a year for life, was outlined in the Supreme Court yesterday when Mrs. Werner filed an application to take the testimony of a number of witnesses in Nevada.

Mrs. Werner contends that she was never the legal wife of Werner because his Nevada divorce from his first wife, Mrs. Alice Redding Werner, is invalid. She alleges that the divorce was not only collusive but insists that the Nevada court never got jurisdiction over the parties because neither had been a resident of the State for the required time.

Among the witnesses Mrs. Werner wants questioned to prove her contention are the other and several clerks of the Riverside Hotel, Reno, who she says will testify that on September 18, 1910, Werner arrived there and registered under the name of Arthur King and was accompanied by an attorney, S. H. Cohen, who registered as S. H. Content. They remained until September 20 and on September 22 Werner returned and remained until September 29. Mrs. Werner says that Mrs. Alice Redding Werner arrived at the same hotel on September 21 accompanied by her sister and registered as Mrs. George Raymond of Chicago. They were at the hotel for nine days until September 30.

Mrs. Giulia Morosi Werner says the divorce suit was filed on September 21, 1910, and a decree granted nine days later. She expects to prove by William M. Schmitzer, a Reno lawyer, who was attorney for Mrs. Alice Redding Werner, that he advised his client that one of the parties to the suit must be a resident of the State for a year.

Frank P. Langan, the Judge who granted the decree, will testify he would not have signed it had he known neither party was a bona fide resident of the State, Mrs. Werner says.

"Giant" Helms.  
Major-General Desmond O'Callaghan writes to the Times that in the armies of Malta, Portsmouth and the Tower of London are massive wrought iron helmets, known as "Giant" Helms, which were formerly used by soldiers to protect their heads when pushing sap rollers before them in the trenches. The helmets weighed twenty-five or thirty pounds and were made of iron plates riveted together with bolts. They were used by the British army in the Boer war and were also used by the German army in the early days of the present war.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact of the bullet. Secondly, the cost of the armor became so high that the earlier craftsmen had studied more carefully the laws of ballistics and the proper use of the various pieces of armor. The later manufacturers produced armor which was too heavy and often of indeterminate value.

"It has been stated that it was the weight of armor, due to its being proof against bullets, which led to its disuse, and this can readily be disproved when we consider that the tactics of the seventeenth century were far more intricate than the simple 'battle array' of earlier centuries, and that the far reaching expeditions of Drake, Columbus and Cortez necessitated a much lighter equipment than was needed for European wars. At the same time it should be noted that the actual weight carried by the twentieth century soldier is much the same as that borne by his forefathers of the sixteenth century.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact of the bullet. Secondly, the cost of the armor became so high that the earlier craftsmen had studied more carefully the laws of ballistics and the proper use of the various pieces of armor. The later manufacturers produced armor which was too heavy and often of indeterminate value.

"It has been stated that it was the weight of armor, due to its being proof against bullets, which led to its disuse, and this can readily be disproved when we consider that the tactics of the seventeenth century were far more intricate than the simple 'battle array' of earlier centuries, and that the far reaching expeditions of Drake, Columbus and Cortez necessitated a much lighter equipment than was needed for European wars. At the same time it should be noted that the actual weight carried by the twentieth century soldier is much the same as that borne by his forefathers of the sixteenth century.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact of the bullet. Secondly, the cost of the armor became so high that the earlier craftsmen had studied more carefully the laws of ballistics and the proper use of the various pieces of armor. The later manufacturers produced armor which was too heavy and often of indeterminate value.

"It has been stated that it was the weight of armor, due to its being proof against bullets, which led to its disuse, and this can readily be disproved when we consider that the tactics of the seventeenth century were far more intricate than the simple 'battle array' of earlier centuries, and that the far reaching expeditions of Drake, Columbus and Cortez necessitated a much lighter equipment than was needed for European wars. At the same time it should be noted that the actual weight carried by the twentieth century soldier is much the same as that borne by his forefathers of the sixteenth century.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact of the bullet. Secondly, the cost of the armor became so high that the earlier craftsmen had studied more carefully the laws of ballistics and the proper use of the various pieces of armor. The later manufacturers produced armor which was too heavy and often of indeterminate value.

"It has been stated that it was the weight of armor, due to its being proof against bullets, which led to its disuse, and this can readily be disproved when we consider that the tactics of the seventeenth century were far more intricate than the simple 'battle array' of earlier centuries, and that the far reaching expeditions of Drake, Columbus and Cortez necessitated a much lighter equipment than was needed for European wars. At the same time it should be noted that the actual weight carried by the twentieth century soldier is much the same as that borne by his forefathers of the sixteenth century.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact of the bullet. Secondly, the cost of the armor became so high that the earlier craftsmen had studied more carefully the laws of ballistics and the proper use of the various pieces of armor. The later manufacturers produced armor which was too heavy and often of indeterminate value.

"It has been stated that it was the weight of armor, due to its being proof against bullets, which led to its disuse, and this can readily be disproved when we consider that the tactics of the seventeenth century were far more intricate than the simple 'battle array' of earlier centuries, and that the far reaching expeditions of Drake, Columbus and Cortez necessitated a much lighter equipment than was needed for European wars. At the same time it should be noted that the actual weight carried by the twentieth century soldier is much the same as that borne by his forefathers of the sixteenth century.

Charles Proulx, curator of the Tower armoury, says there are two reasons for the revival of the helmet. First, the regulation of defensive armor after the invention of gunpowder. First, the body armor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became impracticable because it resisted the impact